

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 24, 2003, the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 1 and 13-17 have been amended and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Frey.

The present invention is directed to solving a problem associated with applications that include objects where a cache is involved. In particular to managing cached objects associated with components that access external storage. The present invention switches cached parts in correspondence to an object managing method selected for the particular type of component. The method that is most suited for the component is selected and the parts (object caching and/or persistent processing) are replaced with a part corresponding to the method. That is, the present invention removes a potential operation mismatch and a degradation in operation can be avoided. The independent claims of the present application emphasize the above-discussed features. The prior art does not teach or suggest such.

Frey is directed to a system that is used for distributing workloads in a distributed object computing system. A request arrives from a client and the system determines which server is to be allocated a process to satisfy the request.

In citing col. 7, lines 6-25, against the selecting device of the invention (see claim 1), the Examiner appears to be equating the object 200 with the selecting device or with the selected object managing method. Clarification of the correspondence is requested. If correspondence with the method is being proposed, the Examiner is requested to note that the object 200 consists of other objects and no discussion of a managing method for a component is provided. If the correspondence is with the selecting device there is also no discussion of a device but instead a discussion of instance inheritance from object 200 to the other objects. The Examiner's comparison of this portion of Frey to the selecting device that selects an object managing method appears to be inappropriate and withdrawal of the rejection for this reason is requested.

In citing col. 7, lines 60-64 in comparison to the switching device of the present invention (see claim 1), the Examiners comparison also seems to be misplaced. This portion of Frey is directed to identifying business objects via key objects. There is no discussion of switching

much less switching so that one of the object caching part and the object persistence processing part are switched to correspond to the selected managing method. The Examiner is requested to clarify the comparison. The Examiner's comparison of this portion of Frey to the switching appears to be inappropriate and withdrawal of the rejection for this reason is requested.

As noted above, the present invention is directed to a system in which a managing method for a type component is selected and at least one of the caching part and the persistent object processing part is switched to correspond to the managing method for the component (see independent claims 13-17). This solves a problem not recognized much less discussed by Frey.

It is submitted that the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over Frey and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 emphasizes that the user can perform the selection. Frey says nothing about this. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/24/04

By: Randall Beckers
Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501